



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,058	11/19/2003	Hubert Jansen	102-548 CIP/CON (P-4136P1)	7216
32752	7590	06/29/2006	EXAMINER	
DAVID W. HIGHET VP & CHIEF IP COUNSEL BECTON DICKINSON AND COMPANY 1 BECTON DRIVE MC 110 FRANKLIN LAKES, NJ 07417-1880			GRAY, PHILLIP A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3767	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/717,058	JANSEN ET AL.
	Examiner Phillip Gray	Art Unit 3767

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 and 21-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 and 21-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/19/2003
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to applicant's communication of 11/19/2003. Currently amended claims 1-15, and 21-35 are pending and rejected. Applicant has previously cancelled claims 16-20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-15, and 21-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Alessio et al. (US 5,389,085) in view of Martin (US 5,417,660). D'Alessio discloses a needle protection device with a cylindrical barrel (66,80,81, Luer portion of syringe in figure 7) a needle cannula (55) connected to end of barrel (figure

7), a elongate tubular holder (60) defining an enclosure, a telescopic shield (50) positioned about at least a portion of said barrel (see figure 11 where shield covers barrel element 66) and is connected to the holder. Further D'Alessio discloses a first, second, and third stop members (58, 65, 75, 72, 73) which operationally couple the shield over the needle cannula and to the holder and by compressing spring (62 biased between holder and shield) and a detent (70) on the holder.

Concerning the proximal and distal stops on the holder and shield, D'Alessio discloses the claimed invention except for orientation of the first, second and third stops between the holder and shield. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an orientation of the first, second and third stops between the holder and shield as proximal and distal to one another and on the opposite structure since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

Concerning the proximal and distal stops on the shield, D'Alessio et al. discloses the claimed invention except for the multiple corresponding stop members on the shield. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have multiple corresponding stop members on the shield, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8 (CA7 1977).

Martin discloses a flange (figure 3) on the barrel that is slidably retained by a holder (12) and a radially extending holder flange (30). Martin further discloses a first proximal stop member (near 44) and third distal stop (50,52) and a second stop (right

and left of 50,52 at figure 3) and the third distal stop member is larger in diameter then the first stop member.

Concerning claims 1-15, and 21-35, D'Alessio discloses the claimed invention except for an extended holder to the barrel and three stop/detent locking system. Martin teaches that it is known to use an extended holder to the barrel and three stop/detent locking system as set forth in paragraphs at column 3-4 to provide a releaseable locking activation system for the safety device. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the safety syringe as taught by D'Alessio with an extended holder to the barrel and three stop/detent locking system as taught by Martin, since such a modification would provide the safety syringe with an extended holder to the barrel and three stop/detent locking system for providing a releaseable locking activation system for the safety device.

Concerning claim 9, D'Alessio et al. in view of Martin discloses the claimed invention except for the detent radially deflectable with respect to the holder (the deflectable detent is on the shield). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the detent radially deflectable with respect to the holder, since it has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Einstein*, 8 USPQ 167.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the

unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-15 and 21-35 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No.10/737,627. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each set of claims specifically claims a barrel/holder/shield/needle safety system with a three-stop/detent system of locking the shield. It is clear that all the element of the claims of 10/717,058 are to be found in the claims of 10/737,627. They are genus and species of one another.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip Gray whose telephone number is (571) 272-7180.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Sirmons can be reached on (571) 272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PLS
PAG

KEVIN C. SIRMONS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

